

REMARKS

A. Request for Suspension Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c)

Applicants hereby request suspension of action by the Office for a period of three months as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). Pursuant to the requirements under § 1.103(c), this request is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination and the fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e) and 1.17(i). The Applicants contemplate submission of additional evidence, e.g., in the form of a Rule 132 declaration, during the period of suspension.

B. Status of the Claims

New claims 108 and 109 have been added and claims 85-87 and 90-91 have been amended. Claims 1-83 and 94-95 were previously canceled. The amendments to claims 85-87 and 90-91 correct a minor typographical error. Support for new claims 108 and 109 can be found, at least in Table 6 on page 30 and on page 8, line 4-8 of the specification. In view of the amendments, claims 84-93 and 96-109 are currently pending in the case.

C. Replacement Inventor Declarations

Newly executed inventor declarations that correctly identify the application number and filing date for this case, signed by each inventor, are included herewith. The entry of the declarations into the record pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.67 is requested. The named inventors are unchanged.

D. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Should be Withdrawn

Although the current claims are directed to a method, the written description rejection focuses on the genus of novel substrate peptides that are used in the method. (The Examiner appears to accept that there is adequate support for the methods steps *per se*, apart from the genus of substrate peptides.) Hence, the arguments here are limited to written description of the peptide substrates.

1. The specification shows that the Applicants were in possession of the invention at the time of filing.

At page 10 of the final action the Examiner observes that Table 6 in the specification effectively discloses 9,870,400 substrate permutations, and incorrectly asserts that the Applicants "selectively trimmed their own genus down by an order of 10^6 " based on what others have discovered.

The Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing. First, Table 6 and the comparable text at p. 5 of the application provide explicit basis for claiming *every single one* of the 9,870,400 peptide permutations defined by the table, individually or as any subgenus. A person provided only with page 30 of the application (which contains Table 6) could write the amino acid sequence of each one of these 9,870,400 different peptides. The Applicants' depiction of the 9,870,400 peptides in Table 6 satisfies the "conciseness" requirement of 35 USC § 112, ¶ 1 better than listing them individually, but the table still provides basis for claiming every peptide individually. The Applicants explicitly state at the bottom of page 13 of the application that they contemplate all embodiments of the invention narrower in scope in any way than the variations specifically mentioned in the summary, thereby providing additional support for subgenus or species claims. If, after the filing date, others "discovered" *substrate properties* of some of the Applicants' peptides, as suggested by the Examiner, these "others" have done nothing more than copy or independently confirm substrate properties of peptides first described by the current Applicants. The Examiner is wrong to allege that the reverse is true.

In addition to the foregoing, the specification contains explicit support for the modified APP molecules that comprise the subgenus of cleavage site sequences recited in the current claims. The original and current independent claims define with particularity two residues on either side of the scissile bond, namely positions P_2 , P_1 , P_1' and P_2' wherein P_2 is N, L, K, S, G, T, D, A, Q or E; P_1 is Y, L, M, Nle, F, or H; P_1' is E, A, D, M, Q, S or G; and P_2' is A, V, N, T, L, F, or S. (Dependent claims in the original and current claim set further define surrounding positions, *e.g.*, P_4 , P_3 , P_3' , and/or P_4' .) Furthermore, page 8, paragraph 2 of the specification contemplates "mutant or derivative APP molecules in which the natural β -secretase cleavage site of wild type APP has been modified to contain a β -secretase cleavage site of one of the substrates of the present invention." Thus, the Applicants did not engage in post-filing "trimming" by focusing on these four residues, rather than those more

distant from the scissile bond and less important to cleavage. The number of permutations in both the claims and in Table 6 *for the four residues in question* is only 2940 ($10 \times 6 \times 7 \times 7$), not 9,870,400, as asserted by the Examiner. The number of permutations in claim 84 of this application also is 2940 – the claim is co-extensive with Table 6. The allegation of 1/1,000,000 “trimming” is plainly incorrect.¹

2. The Examiner incorrectly asserts that the claims encompass a significant number of inoperative substrates.

At page 11 the Examiner asserts that the current scope of the claims does not meet the standard set forth in *Atlas Powder*, an opinion in which the Federal Circuit observed that it is not a function of the claims to specifically exclude possible inoperative embodiments, the question of undue experimentation depending upon whether the number of inoperative embodiments becomes significant. The Examiner specifically asserts that the application fails to support claims concerning substrate peptides wherein P₁ is M, F or H. (Final action p. 13.)

First, even if the claims encompass almost 10 million peptide permutations, as alleged by the Examiner, this genus is not large in the context of high throughput screening techniques that were common in the fields of chemistry and molecular biology at the time the application was filed. Indeed, Patent Office precedent for cases involving biological molecules teach that a single disclosed species is often an adequate description of a large genus of polypeptide or polynucleotide molecules defined by appropriate structural limitations and an activity limitation. The Patent Office routinely allows claims that recite genera of biological macromolecules many orders of magnitude larger than any genus at issue here (whether 2940 or 9,870,400), based on fewer working examples than are present here.

Second, claim 84 explicitly specifies that "the substrate is cleaved between P₁ and P₁' by [the protease]." This activity limitation for the peptide is consistent with guidance for claiming that is found in the PTO's Written Description Training Materials, and it assures that the claim encompasses zero inoperative embodiments. (The application also teaches activity assays that can be used to confirm cleavable substrates through routine screening.)

¹ In fact, the allegation appears to be improperly carried over from a related application with a completely different claim set, with a narrower (but still supported) subgenus.

Third, the record contains substantial evidence that a representative number of the core sequences recited in the claims are cleaved by the protease. According to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Revised Interim Written Description Guidelines, the specification provides an adequate written description of a genus if a *representative* number of species are implicitly or explicitly disclosed. Clearly, all members of the claimed genus are explicitly disclosed in the application. (See, e.g., Table 6.) Furthermore, the application exemplifies the functionality of a representative number substrate sequences. Specifically, the specification demonstrates the functionality of 20 members of the substrate core sequence *i.e.*, SEQ ID NOs: 5, 7, 46, 47, 48, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 133, 135, 136, 137, 141, 143, 144, 145, 147, and 149 in Tables 2-5 and the text spanning pages 15-16. Thus, the application specifically demonstrates the functionality of substrates that comprise N, L, K (see, wt APP), S, G, T (see, ubiquitin) D and A at the P₂ position; Y, L, M (see, wt APP), Nle, and F at the P₁ position; E, A, D, M and S at the P₁' position; and A, V, N, T, F and S at the P₂' position. Finally, when the claimed substrate sequences were substituted into a APP polypeptide the resultant modified APP was found to be highly susceptible to cleavage (page 23, lines 11-15). Thus, a representative number of species in the claimed genus were exemplified in the application as filed.

The references cited by the Examiner further support the sufficiency of the teachings in the application. Specifically, the references exemplify the functionality of additional members of the claimed genus. For example, Shi *et al.* (2005) demonstrates that 21 out of 24 of the tested peptide sequences that were cleaved at least as well as wild type APP are encompassed by the claimed genus of substrates (see Table 2 on page 142). See also U.S. Patent No. 7,132,401 (Table 3), PCT Publication No. WO 02/094985 (page 41, lines 19-25) and PCT Publication No. WO 03/072041 each identifying peptides in the claimed genus that function as substrates.

Although the Examiner himself relies on post-filing date art to challenge patentability, the Examiner finds "unpersuasive" the evidence identified *by the Applicants* in post-filing date art that the claimed genus is operative: "Applicants must show at the time of filing that they were in possession of the claimed invention, not wait to see what others have discovered and selectively trim their own genus down" The Examiner misunderstands the purpose of Applicant's evidence or confuses the question of "possession" with the

question of operability. The excerpts of the application identified above, such as Table 6, establish, incontrovertibly, that the Applicants *were in possession* of the claimed genus. The post-filing date evidence is relied upon solely to further establish that the claimed genus is operative, and the Patent Office's reviewing court has sanctioned the use of post-filing date evidence for this purpose. See, e.g., *Gould v. Quigg*, 3 USPQ2d 1302, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("In this case, the later dated publication was not offered as evidence [to supplement an insufficient disclosure]. Rather, it was offered as evidence . . . that the disclosed device was operative. . . . 'Whether or not an invention would be deemed operative by one of ordinary skill in the art is determined, not at the time the invention was made but rather (at the earliest) at the time of the examiner's call for proof.'" (citing *In re Pottier*, 153 USPQ 407 (CCPA 1967) Other citations omitted.)

3. The Examiner erred by alleging that literature supported a rejection.

To allegedly demonstrate an insufficiency in the teachings of the application, the Examiner cited Gruninger-Leitch *et al.* (2002), Majer *et al.* (1997), Sauder *et al.* 2000, Shi *et al.* (2005) and Tomasselli *et al.* (2003), and argued that these references show peptide substrates with a variety of substitutions show *decreased* cleavage by aspartic proteases and thereby demonstrate that the genus of substrate peptides are insufficiently defined in the instant application. However, the only substrates that satisfy the structural limitation of claim 84 that are demonstrated as inoperative are two mutant APP sequences from Shi (page 142, Table 2), and even these two fall outside the claims (because if they are not cleaved then they fail to satisfy the functional limitation of the claim). While some other substrates of the cited references may be non-optimal, the references do not characterize any other substrate within the claims as inoperative. Moreover, it is not a function of the claims to specifically exclude possible inoperative embodiments. The Federal Circuit has stated:

Where there are a myriad of operative combinations, the inclusion of a few that are not operative need not invalidate a patent. The patent's claims can be construed to exclude those inoperative combinations. Including such inoperative combinations within the scope of a claim does not constitute invalidating "overclaiming." *Atlas Powder Co. v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 588 F. Supp. 1455, 221 U.S.P.Q. 426 (Tex. 1983).

In this case the instant claims explicitly exclude any inoperative embodiments. Nonetheless, two inoperative APP substrates amongst 21 operative APP substrates

confirmed by Shi do not constitute a significant number of inoperative embodiments. Thus, none of the references cited by the Examiner support the instant rejection.

The Examiner pointed to Table 1 of Gruninger-Leitch *et al.* to illustrate that a single change to the amino acid sequence of a substrate may result in a decrease in cleavage activity. However, all substrates set out in Table 1 of Gruninger-Leitch *et al.*, that were designed to be cleaved by the β -secretase enzyme, exhibited some activity. The inactive substrates were either designed to be cleaved by α -secretase or renin, and are not encompassed by the claims.

The Examiner pointed to examples in Gruninger-Leitch *et al.* which demonstrate that a single point mutation at the P₁' or P₄ of the Swedish mutant cleavage site results in a drop in the rate of cleavage. However, it is unfair to assert that substrates cleaved at a lower efficiency do not support the claimed genus when this measured efficiency was determined by a comparison of cleavage of the highly efficient "Swedish mutation" substrate. Even the wild-type substrate has only 9% cleavage compared to the Swedish mutation, yet it can be used in assays. These cited documents further support the claimed genus with observations such as, "[t]he data presented above also indicates that BACE can accept a wide variety of peptidic substrate." (Gruninger-Leitch *et al.* page 4692, bottom of right column.) and "[t]he results of the present investigation further indicate that BACE1 can accept a wide variety of amino acid residues at the β -scissile-bond of its substrate both in vitro and in cells." (Shi *et al.* page 146, left column). The Applicants impeach the art cited by the Examiner in greater detail at pages 11-14 of the amendment filed in December, 2006.

The claims read on substrates that are longer than 6 amino acids. However, the Applicants teach in the application (as recognized by the Examiner and nicely explained in their later-published paper by Tomasselli *et al.*) that additional amino acids appears to enhance the reactivity of β -secretase toward the recognition site. (See Tomasselli at p. 1009 and Table 1, for example.)

E. Double Patenting Rejections Should be Withdrawn

In the first office action, claims were rejected under §101 as allegedly coextensive in scope with pending claims in related applications. Claims in related applications were narrowed by amendment filed on December 5, 2006, rendering moot the


double patenting rejection. It should have been withdrawn in the final action. No nonstatutory double patenting rejections were made and Applicants request that such rejections be held in abeyance until claims are found otherwise allowable.

F. Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided with any questions.

Dated: February 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David A. Gass

Registration No.: 38,153

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant